

1 James M. Finberg (State Bar No. 114850)
2 Steven M. Tindall (State Bar No. 187862)
3 Peter E. Leckman (State Bar No. 235721)
4 LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN &
5 BERNSTEIN, LLP
6 Embarcadero Center West
7 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
8 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
9 Telephone: (415) 956-1000
10 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

11 *Counsel for the Plaintiffs*

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GOPI VEDACHALAM and KANGANA
BERI, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TATA AMERICA INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION, a New York
corporation; TATA CONSULTANCY
SERVICES, LTD, an Indian Corporation;
and TATA SONS, LTD, an Indian
Corporation.

Defendants.

CASE NO. C 06-0963 (VRW)

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR CONVERSION; BREACH
OF CONTRACT; UNJUST ENRICHMENT;
UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES; AND
VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA WAGE AND
HOUR LAWS**

CLASS ACTION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Individual and representative Plaintiffs Gopi Vedachalam and Kangana Beri (“Plaintiffs”)
 2 allege, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, as follows:

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 1. Plaintiffs bring this class action on behalf of various Classes of employees of Tata
 5 Consultancy Services, Ltd., and Tata Sons, Ltd., Indian corporations headquartered in Mumbai,
 6 India, as well as their U.S. subsidiary, Tata America International Corporation (collectively
 7 referred to as “TCS” or “Defendants”).

8 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
 9 § 1332, as recently amended by the Class Action Fairness Act, because the aggregate amount
 10 claimed by the individual members of the proposed Classes exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of
 11 interest and costs. The Nationwide Classes each exceed 100 persons, and their members are
 12 citizens of India and other countries, and Defendant Tata America International is a citizen of
 13 New York. The California Classes exceed 100 persons, and the California Classes’ members are
 14 citizens of India and other countries, and Defendant Tata America International is a citizen of
 15 New York.

16 3. Personal jurisdiction over TCS is proper because it has purposefully availed itself
 17 of the privilege of conducting business activities within the State of California by employing
 18 workers within California, and selling its services within the State. TCS generally has maintained
 19 systematic and continuous business contacts with California.

20 4. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e5(f) and 28 U.S.C.
 21 § 1391 (b) & (c). Many of the acts complained of herein occurred in this District and gave rise to
 22 the claims alleged. TCS conducts business in this District and employs hundreds of workers
 23 within the State of California.

24 **SUMMARY OF CLAIMS**

25 5. Plaintiffs are current and former employees of TCS, who were “deputed” to the
 26 United States by TCS in order to work in-house for TCS’s customers. Plaintiffs were not paid the
 27 wages they were promised by TCS, were forced to pay back to TCS wages previously earned, and
 28 were injured by TCS’s systematic violations of California’s wage and hour laws.

1 6. Plaintiffs are members of, and seek to represent, the following nationwide class:

2 All non-U.S. citizens who were, are, or will be employed by TCS at
3 anytime since February 14, 2000 through the date of the final
4 disposition of this action who were promised a higher amount of
5 wages than they actually received (“Nationwide Class A”).

6 7. Plaintiffs allege, on behalf of themselves and Nationwide Class A, that TCS did
7 not pay them the gross wages that TCS promised it would pay them in exchange for working for
8 TCS in the United States. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and Nationwide Class A members,
9 seek damages, injunctive relief, and restitution of all unjust enrichment Defendants have enjoyed
as a result of TCS’s contract breaches.

10 8. Plaintiff Vedachalam is a member of, and seeks to represent, the following
11 nationwide class:

12 All non-U.S. citizens who were, are, or will be employed by TCS at
13 anytime since February 14, 2000 through the date of the final
14 disposition of this action who were forced to endorse and pay to
15 TCS their tax refund checks (“Nationwide Class B”).

16 9. Named Plaintiff Vedachalam alleges, on behalf of himself and Nationwide Class B
17 members, that TCS forced them to pay back to the Defendants wages that the employees had
18 previously earned in the form of tax refund checks. Plaintiff Vedachalam, on behalf of himself
19 and Nationwide Class B members, seeks damages, injunctive relief, and restitution of all unjust
enrichment Defendants have enjoyed as a result of these practices.

20 10. Plaintiffs further allege, on behalf of themselves and all non-U.S. citizens who
21 were, are, or will be employed by TCS in California at any time since February 14, 2000 through
22 the date of the final disposition of this action, that TCS violated various California labor code
23 provisions by forcing their California employees to pay back to the Defendants wages that the
24 employees had previously earned (“California Class A”). Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and
25 California Class A members, seek damages, injunctive relief, and restitution of all unjust
enrichment Defendants have enjoyed as a result of these practices.

26 11. Plaintiff Beri, on behalf of herself and all non-U.S. citizens who were, are, or will
27 be employed by TCS in California as technical support workers, including those with the titles

1 Assistant Systems Engineer Trainee, Assistant Systems Engineer, Information Technology
2 Analyst, and all others who had the primary duties of installing, maintaining, and/or supporting
3 computer software and/or hardware, further alleges that TCS violated California law by
4 improperly misclassifying these employees as exempt from overtime pay under California law
5 (“California Class B”). Named Plaintiff Beri, on behalf of herself and California Class B, seeks
6 damages, injunctive relief, and restitution of all unjust enrichment Defendants have enjoyed as a
7 result of these practices.

8 12. Plaintiff Beri, on behalf of herself and all non-U.S. citizens who worked for TCS
9 in California at any time since February 14, 2000 through the date of the final disposition of this
10 action, and who are no longer working for TCS (“California Class C”), further alleges that at least
11 until July 2005, TCS had an unlawful “use-it-or-lose-it” vacation policy, whereby employees who
12 left TCS would forfeit vacation time that they earned, but did not use. Plaintiff Beri, on behalf of
13 herself and California Class C, further alleges that TCS violated California labor law by failing to
14 pay discharged employees all wages earned and unpaid within 72 hours of termination. Named
15 Plaintiff Beri, on behalf of herself and California Class C, seeks damages, injunctive relief, and
16 restitution of all unjust enrichment Defendants have enjoyed as a result of these practices.

THE PARTIES

18 13. Plaintiff Gopi Vedachalam is a citizen of India, legally working and living in
19 California under an L-1 visa. (The L-1 visa is used to transfer an employee to a US parent,
20 affiliate, subsidiary, or branch office from a related foreign company.) In 1997, Mr. Vedachalam
21 began working for Tata Consultancy Services in Bangalore, India. In April 2000, Tata
22 Consultancy Services “deputed” Mr. Vedachalam, sending him to work for Tata America
23 International in the United States. Since April 2000, Mr. Vedachalam has worked in the United
24 States for Tata America International and Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd. From 2000 to 2003,
25 Vedachalam worked in Hayward, California, as a TCS project manager for Target; since 2003, he
26 has worked as a TCS project manager for 21st Century Insurance in Woodland Hills, California.

27 14. Plaintiff Kangana Beri is a citizen of India, legally living in California under an H-
28 4 visa. (The H-4 visa is a dependant visa for someone whose spouse lives and works legally in the

1 United States on an H-1B visa.) In 2001, Ms. Beri began working for TCS in New Delhi, India.
 2 In April 2003, Ms. Beri was deputed to the United States. TCS classified Ms. Beri as an
 3 Assistant Systems Engineer and her primary duties were to maintain and support computer
 4 software. Ms. Beri consistently worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and forty (40)
 5 hours in a workweek, without receiving overtime compensation as required by California law.
 6 Ms. Beri did not take any vacation while working for TCS and has never received compensation
 7 from TCS for vacation days she did not use. Ms. Beri has not worked for TCS since September
 8 2004.

9 15. Defendant Tata America International Corporation (“Tata America”), a U.S.
 10 subsidiary of Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a New
 11 York corporation operating in the San Francisco Bay Area as well as throughout the State of
 12 California and the United States. Tata America’s principal place of business is in New York,
 13 New York.

14 16. Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd. is an Indian corporation with its
 15 principal place of business in Mumbai, India. Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd. is wholly owned
 16 by Defendant Tata Sons, Ltd., an Indian corporation

17 17. Defendant Tata Sons, Ltd., is an Indian corporation with its principal place of
 18 business in Mumbai, India. Tata Sons is the parent company of Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd.

19 **STATEMENT OF FACTS APPLICABLE TO ALL CLAIMS**

20 A. **TCS’s Deputation of Its Employees to the United States**

21 18. Most TCS employees in the United States are non-U.S. citizens. Most of these
 22 individuals have worked for TCS in India and are “deputed” to work in the United States,
 23 meaning that the employees continue to work for TCS, but are stationed in the United States.

24 19. Each employee signs a Deputation agreement that outlines the terms and
 25 conditions of his or her employment in the United States.

26 20. These employees are granted visas, which allow the employees to work and live in
 27 the United States. TCS, under the penalty of perjury, makes certain representations to the U.S.
 28 government and to its employees on these applications about the amount of wages each employee

1 will earn during his or her stay in the United States.

2 21. The Deputation agreements state that the employee's gross amount of
 3 compensation shall be includable as earnings in the United States and reported to the U.S. Internal
 4 Revenue Service.

5 22. The Deputation agreements state that "[i]n addition to the compensation and
 6 benefits you currently receive and will continue to receive in India while on Deputation, you shall
 7 receive additional compensation in the United States in the gross amount of" a certain number of
 8 dollars.

9 23. While in the United States, these employees are paid by TCS, Ltd., through Tata
 10 America International.

11 **B. TCS's Operations**

12 24. TCS is the information technologies outsourcing/consulting arm of the Indian
 13 conglomerate Tata Group. Tata America is a U.S. subsidiary of TCS. Tata America has branch
 14 offices throughout the United States, including, but not limited to, Arizona, California,
 15 Connecticut, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Michigan,
 16 New York, New Jersey, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin.

17 25. On information and belief, Plaintiffs believe that most TCS employees, working in
 18 the United States, work on-site with other U.S. businesses.

19 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

20 26. Plaintiff Vedachalam and/or Plaintiff Beri bring this class action pursuant to Fed.
 21 R. Civ. P. 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3), on behalf of a two nationwide classes and three California
 22 classes, as described below.

23 **II. NATIONWIDE CLASSES**

24 **A. Nationwide Class A**

25 27. Plaintiffs are members of, and seek to represent, the following nationwide class:
 26 All non-U.S. citizens who were, are, or will be employed by TCS at
 27 anytime since February 14, 2000 through the date of the final
 disposition of this action who were promised a higher amount of
 wages than they actually received ("Nationwide Class A").

1 28. When Defendants “depute” their Indian employees to the United States, they
 2 promise those employees a certain gross salary in addition to the salary they will continue to earn
 3 in India. This promise is contained in the Deputation Terms Agreement, which reads: “In addition
 4 to the compensation and benefits you currently receive and will continue to receive in India while
 5 on Deputation, you shall receive additional compensation in the United States in the gross amount
 6 of” a certain number of dollars.

7 29. For example, TCS promised Plaintiff Beri a gross amount of \$50,000 in addition
 8 to the compensation and benefits she received in India. Ms. Beri did not receive this gross
 9 amount in addition to the compensation and benefits she received in India when she worked for
 10 TCS in the United States.

11 30. TCS also makes certain salary representations to the employees and to the U.S.
 12 government in the employees’ visa petitions. For example, under penalty of perjury, in Plaintiff
 13 Vedachalam’s May 2003 visa application to the United States, TCS represented to Plaintiff
 14 Vedachalam (and to the U.S. government) that from May 30, 2003 through May 29, 2005,
 15 Plaintiff Vedachalam would receive \$74,000 per year. Mr. Vedachalam did not receive this
 16 amount of annual salary in 2004 or 2005, and is not currently receiving this amount of annual
 17 salary.

18 31. In addition to not paying their employees the amount promised, TCS, in many
 19 instances, decreased their employees’ wages further by requiring their employees to sign over
 20 their tax refund checks or by requiring them to pay to receive the tax forms required to file an
 21 income tax return.

22 32. For example, in 2004, for tax year 2003, Plaintiff Beri informed TCS that she
 23 would like to file her own tax returns jointly with her husband. TCS unlawfully refused to
 24 provide her with her W-2 tax forms. See 26 C.F.R. § 31.6051-1 (setting forth the requirement that
 25 employers must provide their employees with two copies of their W-2 forms on or before January
 26 31 of the year following the tax year). Ultimately, TCS informed her that they would only provide
 27 her with her W-2 form if she first paid TCS \$2,440. This was the amount that TCS calculated
 28 that she would receive as a refund had she been unmarried and filed as an unmarried individual.

1 Plaintiff Beri wrote a personal check to TCS in that amount and only then, months after January
 2 31, 2004, did TCS provide her with her W-2 forms.

3 33. TCS has not repaid Plaintiff Beri for the amount they required her to pay to receive
 4 her 2003 W-2 forms.

5 34. In no signed agreement were Plaintiffs promised a lower net salary rather than the
 6 gross salary set forth in their Deputation Terms Agreements and/or represented to them in their
 7 visa petitions.

8 35. On information and belief, Plaintiffs were never provided with an "Overseas
 9 Deputation Policy."

10 **B. Nationwide Class B**

11 36. Named Plaintiff Vedachalam is a member of, and seeks to represent, the following
 12 nationwide class:

13 All non-U.S. citizens who were, are, or will be employed by TCS at
 14 anytime since February 14, 2000 through the date of the final
 15 disposition of this action who were forced to endorse and pay to
 16 TCS their tax refund checks ("Nationwide Class B").

17 37. Plaintiff Vedachalam was paid a gross amount monthly, and federal and state
 18 income taxes were withheld from these gross monthly wages.

19 38. At least until July 2005, Defendants required that their non-U.S. citizen employees
 20 sign power of attorney agreements that delegated an outside agency to calculate and submit each
 21 employee's tax returns to the applicable state and federal tax authorities.

22 39. On information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that during each year of the class
 23 period, each Nationwide Class B member received a state and federal tax refund check,
 24 representing the amount of taxes they had overpaid the state and federal tax agencies.

25 40. Each year that Plaintiff Vedachalam worked for Defendants in the United States,
 26 the Internal Revenue Service and California Franchise Tax Board sent to Defendants checks made
 27 out to Plaintiff Vedachalam in the amount of tax he overpaid throughout the preceding year.
 28 Each year that Plaintiff Vedachalam has worked for Defendants in the United States, Defendants
 have required him to endorse his tax refund checks and send those checks back to the company.

1 In 2004, for example, TCS sent Plaintiff Vedachalam an “Urgent Memo” that stated: “Thank you
 2 very much for your excellent support in assisting us to file the tax return on your behalf for the
 3 year [current year]. We are now forwarding you the tax refund check received from the Tax
 4 Authority. Please sign on the reverse of the cheque and return it to the below mentioned address.
 5 Your assistance in the [sic] regard will be highly appreciated.”

6 41. On information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that when Defendants receive the tax
 7 refund checks from the respective tax agencies, made out to each of their non-U.S.-citizen
 8 employees, they send their non-U.S.-citizen employees an “Urgent Memo,” demanding that the
 9 employees endorse the checks and send them back to Defendants.

10 42. Vedachalam did not provide TCS with his tax over-payment, *i.e.*, his refund check,
 11 voluntarily. Instead, he had no choice in the matter, because—prior to sending his refund checks
 12 to him—TCS stamped the back of the checks with a stamp that read: “Pay to the Order of . . .
 13 Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd.”

14 43. On information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have retained the
 15 proceeds from the Nationwide Class B members’ tax refund checks by requiring that employees
 16 endorse their refund checks for TCS’s benefit. Defendants have not repaid these funds to their
 17 employees.

18 44. On information and belief, Plaintiff Vedachalam alleges that Defendants have
 19 taken the proceeds from his state and federal tax refunds for each year that he has worked in the
 20 United States. Defendants have never repaid Vedachalam the tax refund money that they
 21 required him to sign over to TCS.

22 45. On information and belief, Plaintiff Vedachalam alleges that Defendants may have
 23 received as much as \$5,000 per year, per employee as a result of Defendants’ requirement that
 24 each Nationwide Class B member sign over his or her tax refund checks to Defendants.

25 46. Plaintiff Vedachalam estimates that Defendants have retained nearly \$25,000 in
 26 federal and state tax refunds that rightfully belong to him.

27 47. In no signed agreement (or any other document) were Plaintiffs told that they
 28 would receive a set net pay amount that TCS would then “gross-up” to include their taxes.

1 Instead, Plaintiffs Vedachalam and Beri believed that they were receiving a gross amount from
 2 TCS, out of which taxes were being withheld.

3 **C. Suitability Of The Nationwide Classes for Class Certification**

4 48. The members of the Nationwide Classes identified herein are so numerous that
 5 joinder of all members is impracticable. At the end of 2005, Defendants employed thousands of
 6 non-U.S.-citizen employees in the United States. Although the precise number of employees
 7 affected by the illegal practices alleged herein is currently unknown, it is far greater than can be
 8 addressed feasibly through joinder. The precise number is ascertainable from Defendants'
 9 records.

10 49. There are many questions of law and fact common to the Nationwide Classes, and
 11 these questions predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. Common
 12 questions of fact or law include, among others: (1) whether Defendants had a systematic plan to
 13 breach the contracts of their non-U.S.-citizen employees (Nationwide Class A); (2) whether
 14 Defendants unlawfully held hostage the W-2 tax forms of those employees who wished to file
 15 their own tax returns, requiring that such employees pay TCS a set amount of money before TCS
 16 relinquished the tax forms, thereby lowering the amount of salary promised in their agreements
 17 (Nationwide Class A); (3) whether Plaintiff Vedachalam and the proposed class have a right to
 18 their individual tax refund checks (Nationwide Class B); (4) whether Defendants unlawfully
 19 compelled the Plaintiff Vedachalam and the proposed class to turn over those refund checks to
 20 TCS (Nationwide Class B); (5) whether Defendants exerted an act of ownership or dominion over
 21 the personal property of Plaintiff Vedachalam and the proposed Class (Nationwide Class B);
 22 (6) whether, by signing over their refund checks to TCS, Plaintiff Vedachalam and the proposed
 23 Class conferred a benefit to Defendants (Nationwide Class B); (7) whether Defendants were
 24 aware of the benefit they received (Nationwide Class B); (8) whether Defendants have retained
 25 this benefit under circumstances that make it inequitable for Defendants to retain the benefit
 26 without the payment of its value (Nationwide Class B); and (9) whether injunctive relief and other
 27 equitable remedies (including restitution) and compensatory and punitive damages are warranted
 28 for the Nationwide Classes (Nationwide Classes A and B).

1 50. The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the respective Nationwide
 2 Class(es) they seek to represent.

3 51. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
 4 members of the Nationwide Classes. Plaintiffs' counsel is competent and highly experienced in
 5 complex class actions in general and employment-related class actions in particular.

6 52. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because TCS
 7 has acted and/or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Nationwide Classes,
 8 making appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiffs and the Nationwide
 9 Classes. The law entitles members of the Nationwide Classes to injunctive relief, including
 10 restitution of the profits Defendants have unlawfully acquired and retained through their illegal
 11 acts.

12 53. Class certification is also appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) because
 13 common questions of fact and law predominate over any individual questions affecting members
 14 of the Nationwide Classes, and because a class action is superior to other available methods for
 15 the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation. The members of Nationwide Classes have
 16 been damaged and are entitled to recovery as a result of Defendants' common, uniform, and
 17 illegal policies and practices. Defendants have computerized payroll and personnel data that will
 18 make calculation of damages for specific members of the Nationwide Classes relatively
 19 straightforward.

20 **III. CALIFORNIA CLASSES**

21 **A. California Class A**

22 54. Plaintiffs are members of, and seek to represent, the following Class:

23 All non-U.S. citizens who were, are, or will be employed by TCS in
 24 California at any time from February 14, 2002 through the date of
 25 the final disposition of this action who were forced to pay back to
 26 TCS previously-earned wages ("California Class A").

27 55. By requiring that their non-U.S.-citizen employees either (1) sign over their tax
 28 refund checks to the company or (2) pay TCS in order to receive their W-2 tax forms, Defendants
 required their California employees to repay to Defendants wages those employees had

1 previously earned.

2 56. The tax overpayment, or refund check, that TCS requires each class member to
 3 submit to the Defendants represents the amount of the class members' gross wages that they
 4 overpaid to the California Franchise Tax Board and the Internal Revenue Service from their
 5 monthly paychecks.

6 57. The class members are entitled to this amount because, among other reasons, (1) it
 7 represents the amount that they have overpaid the tax authorities from their gross wages and
 8 (2) taking the tax refund checks widens the gap between the amount that TCS promised these
 9 employees and the amount TCS actually paid them.

10 58. Plaintiff Vedachalam estimates that Defendants have required him to return to
 11 Defendants nearly \$5,000 in earned wages per year. Plaintiff Beri estimates that Defendants
 12 required her to return to the TCS \$2,440 in earned wages. On information and belief, Plaintiffs
 13 allege that Defendants have required each member of California Class A to return similar
 14 amounts to Defendants.

15 59. While working in the United States for Defendants, Plaintiffs have not been
 16 provided with accurate, itemized wage statements. The statements TCS provided misstated the
 17 employees' gross income and net income because the statements did not account for the wages
 18 Defendants required the Plaintiffs to return to them. Moreover, Defendants regularly changed the
 19 number of exemptions listed on Plaintiffs' wage statements without informing Plaintiffs of the
 20 change, the reasons for the change, or its consequences. On information and belief, Plaintiffs
 21 allege that other members of the California Class A similarly did not receive accurate, itemized
 22 wage statements.

23 60. By not accounting for the tax refunds that TCS required its employees return to
 24 TCS, TCS has willfully refused to provide its employees with accurate, itemized wage
 25 statements.

26 **B. California Class B**

27 61. Plaintiff Beri is a member of, and seeks to represent, the following Class:

28 All non-U.S. citizens who were, are, or will be employed by TCS in

California at any time within the four years prior to the date of the filing of this Complaint through the date of the final disposition of this action, as technical support workers—including Assistant Systems Engineers Trainees, Assistant Systems Engineers, Information Technology Analysts—and all others whose primary duties are installing, maintaining, and/or supporting computer software and/or hardware, and who worked over forty (40) hours per week and/or worked over eight (8) hours per day and were not paid at least time and one half for all overtime hours worked (“California Class B”).

62. Defendants employ a number of individuals in California whose primary tasks place them in a category that legally necessitates that TCS pay them premium overtime wages for all hours worked over forty (40) hours per week and all hours worked over eight (8) hours per day.

63. Plaintiff Beri worked for TCS under the title Assistant Systems Engineer, and her primary duties were maintaining and supporting computer software for TCS's clients. Others at TCS, including those classified as Assistant Systems Engineer Trainees, Assistant Systems Engineers, and Informational Technology Analysts engage in similar work and are improperly classified as exempt for California's wage and hour laws, requiring the payment of overtime wages for overtime hours worked.

64. TCS required Plaintiff Beri to record 8 hours for every day that she worked despite the fact that she routinely worked more than 8 hours a day.

C. California Class C

65. Named Plaintiff Beri is a member of, and seeks to represent, the following Class:

All non-U.S. citizens who worked for TCS in California at any time from February 14, 2002 to the present and who are no longer working for TCS (“California Class C”).

66. TCS gives both U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizen employees 15 vacation days a year. All employees can carry over only five unused days to the following year. At least until 2005, although U.S. citizen employees could cash-in unused vacation days in excess of the five days carried over, non-U.S.-citizen employees could not cash in their unused vacation days and were required to forfeit any unused vacation days beyond the five carried over without any compensation.

1 67. Plaintiff Beri never took vacation from TCS during the time that she worked for
 2 the company.

3 68. Although Plaintiff Beri no longer works for TCS, Defendants have never paid her
 4 for the vacation days she forfeited.

5 69. On information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have failed adequately
 6 to compensate their dismissed California employees for all of the vacation time they earned but
 7 did not use.

8 70. On information and belief, Plaintiff Beri further alleges that TCS violated
 9 California labor law by failing to pay California Class B members all wages earned and unpaid
 10 within 72 hours of discharge.

11 **D. Suitability of California Classes for Class Certification**

12 71. The members of the California Classes are so numerous that joinder of all
 13 members is impracticable. At the end of 2005, Defendants employed hundreds of non-U.S.-
 14 citizen employees throughout California. Although the precise number of California employees
 15 affected by the illegal practices alleged herein is currently unknown, it is far greater than can be
 16 feasibly addressed through joinder. The precise number is easily ascertainable from Defendants'
 17 records.

18 72. There are many questions of law and fact common to the proposed California
 19 Classes, and these common questions predominate over any questions affecting only individual
 20 members. Common questions of fact or law include, among others: (1) whether Defendants
 21 compelled their California employees to repay wages already earned (California Class A);
 22 (2) whether Defendants misclassified certain employees as exempt from California's overtime
 23 laws (California Class B); (3) whether Defendants refused to reimburse their former California
 24 employees for vested vacation time (California Class C); (4) whether Defendants failed
 25 adequately to pay their dismissed California employees within 72 hours of those class members'
 26 terminations from the company (California Class C); (5) whether Defendants willfully failed to
 27 provide their California employees with accurate, itemized statements of their wages (California
 28 Classes A, B, and C); and (6) whether the law entitles the Class members to restitution of all

unjust enrichment Defendants have enjoyed from Defendants' alleged violations of the California Labor Code (California Classes A, B, and C).

73. The claims of Plaintiffs Vedachalam and/or Beri are typical of the claims of the various Classes.

74. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the California Classes. Plaintiffs' counsel is competent and highly experienced in complex class actions in general and employment class actions in particular.

75. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Defendants have acted and/or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the California Classes, making appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiffs and the proposed California Classes. The law entitles the members of the California Classes to injunctive relief to end Defendants' common, uniform, and illegal practices, including restitution of the profits Defendants have acquired through their illegal acts.

76. Class certification is also appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) because common questions of fact and law predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the proposed California Classes, and because a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation. Defendants' practices have damaged the members of the proposed California Classes, and the law entitles the proposed California Classes to recovery as a result of Defendants' common, uniform, and illegal practices. Defendants have computerized payroll and personnel data that will make calculation of damages for specific members of the proposed California Classes relatively straightforward.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
BREACH OF CONTRACT—NATIONWIDE CLASS A
(by Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the proposed Nationwide Class A)

77. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

78. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of themselves and the proposed Nationwide Class A.

79. The class period for the proposed Nationwide Class A is from February 14, 2000

1 through the date of judgment.

2 80. By failing to pay Nationwide Class A members the amount of compensation
 3 promised in their Deputation Terms Agreements, Defendants breached those contracts. By
 4 failing to pay Nationwide Class A members the amount promised as reflected in their visa
 5 applications, which TCS signed under the penalty of perjury, Defendants breached their
 6 agreements with the Nationwide Class A members.

7 81. Defendants' breach of the terms of their contracts with the members of the
 8 Nationwide Class entitles those members to restitution and recovery of all damages caused by
 9 Defendants' nonperformance.

10 82. It is inequitable for Defendants to retain the funds promised to the proposed
 11 Nationwide Class Members.

12 83. Defendants' conduct as alleged above establishes a claim for breach of contract, as
 13 articulated by the Restatement (Second) of Contracts, the laws of New York (Tata America's
 14 state of incorporation and principal place of business) and, in the alternative, the laws of
 15 California, or the laws of Maryland.

16 84. Plaintiffs request relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

17 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
CONVERSION—NATIONWIDE CLASS B
 18 **(by Plaintiff Vedachalam on behalf of himself and proposed Nationwide Class B)**

19 85. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 20 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

21 86. Plaintiff Vedachalam brings this claim on behalf of himself and proposed
 22 Nationwide Class B.

23 87. The class period for proposed Nationwide Class B is from February 14, 2000
 24 through the date of judgment.

25 88. The tax refund checks TCS required its employees to return to the company
 26 represent the difference between the amount of the employees' earnings that was withheld for
 27 taxes and the amount of taxes actually owed. This amount was withheld from the gross wages
 28 that the Defendants promised to pay Plaintiff Vedachalam and Nationwide Class B members.

1 Plaintiff Vedachalam and Nationwide Class B members, therefore, have the right to receive and
 2 retain their federal and state income tax refund checks.

3 89. By requiring that each class member sign over their state and federal income tax
 4 refund check to Defendants, Defendants have intentionally taken dominion and control over
 5 Plaintiff Vedachalam's and Nationwide Class B members' tax refund checks.

6 90. Defendants' actions seriously interfere with Plaintiff Vedachalam's and proposed
 7 Nationwide Class B members' rights to control and use their federal and state income tax refund
 8 checks.

9 91. Defendants' actions have caused Plaintiff Vedachalam and the proposed
 10 Nationwide Class Members significant financial injury. Defendants' alleged conversion of
 11 Plaintiff Vedachalam's and proposed Nationwide Class B members' state and federal income tax
 12 refund checks has deprived each class member of as much as thousands of dollars per year.

13 92. Defendants' conduct as alleged above constitutes conversion, as articulated by the
 14 Restatement (Second) of Torts, the laws of New York (Tata America's state of incorporation and
 15 principal place of business), and, in the alternative, the laws of California.

16 93. Plaintiff Vedachalam requests relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

17 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
UNJUST ENRICHMENT—NATIONWIDE CLASSES A AND B
 18 **(by Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and Nationwide Classes A and B)**

19 94. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 20 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

21 95. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of themselves and the Nationwide Classes they
 22 respectively represent.

23 96. By endorsing and sending their federal and state income tax refund checks to
 24 Defendants and/or by being forced to pay to receive their W-2 tax forms, each proposed
 25 Nationwide Class member conferred a substantial benefit upon Defendants each year, worth as
 26 much as thousands of dollars per Class member.

27 97. By requiring each member of the proposed Nationwide Class to sign tax refund
 28 checks over to Defendants and submit the checks to them and/or requiring that each Class

member pay before receiving their W-2s, Defendants knew of and fully appreciated the benefit they were receiving.

98. It is inequitable for Defendants to retain tax refunds that rightfully belong to the proposed Nationwide Class Members.

99. By breaching their contracts with the Nationwide Class members in a way that allowed TCS to retain funds that rightfully belonged to the class members, each proposed Nationwide Class member has conferred a substantial benefit to the Defendants.

100. By breaching their contracts with the Nationwide Class members in a way that allowed TCS to retain funds that rightfully belonged to the class members, Defendants knew of and fully appreciated the benefit they were receiving.

101. It is inequitable for Defendants to retain the funds that rightfully belong to the proposed Nationwide Class Members.

102. Defendants' conduct as alleged above establishes a claim for unjust enrichment, as articulated by the Restatement (Third) of Restitution and Unjust Enrichment, the laws of New York (Tata America's state of incorporation and principal place of business) and, in the alternative, the laws of California or Maryland.

103. Plaintiffs request relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

CAUSES OF ACTION UNDER OTHER STATES' LAWS

104. Formal discovery in this case has not yet begun, and Plaintiffs have not had access to information that will allow them to know with certainty which State's (or States') law of conversion, unjust enrichment, and contracts governs Defendants' conduct. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the conversion, unjust enrichment and contract law of New York and/or California and/or Maryland shall govern here. To the extent that discovery reveals that another State's law governs the conduct of Defendants' in this controversy, Plaintiffs allege causes of action for conversion, unjust enrichment, and breach of contract under any State's law based on the allegations that Defendants' conduct constituted conversion, unjust enrichment and breach of contract as articulated by the Restatement (Second) of Torts, the Restatement (Third) of Restitution and Unjust Enrichment, and the Restatement (Second) of Contracts. To the extent

1 that discovery reveals that another State's (or States') law of contract, conversion and unjust
 2 enrichment governs, Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend to allege causes of action under such
 3 State's (or States') law.

4 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 221

5 **(by Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and proposed California Class A)**

6 105. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 7 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

8 106. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of themselves and proposed California
 9 Class A.

10 107. The class period for California Class A is from February 14, 2002 through the date
 11 of the final disposition of this action.

12 108. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to
 13 collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said
 14 employee."

15 109. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1171.5(a),

16 All protections, rights, and remedies available under state law,
 17 except any reinstatement remedy prohibited by federal law, are
 18 available to all individuals regardless of immigration status who
 have applied for employment, or who are or who have been
 employed, in this state.

19 110. Defendants' conduct as alleged above constitutes a violation of California Labor
 20 Code § 221, because by requiring Plaintiffs and proposed California Class members to sign over
 21 their tax refunds and/or pay TCS to receive their W-2 forms, Defendants required Plaintiffs and
 22 the proposed California Class A to return to Defendants a substantial part of the wages paid by
 23 Defendants to them.

24 111. Plaintiffs request relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

25

26

27

28

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
VIOLATION OF CAL. WAGE ORDER NO. 4; CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1194
(by Plaintiff Beri on behalf of herself and proposed California Class B)

112. Plaintiff Beri hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

113. The class period for California Class B is from anytime within the four years prior to the date of the filing of this Complaint through the date of the final disposition of this action.

114. California law requires an employer, such as Defendant, to pay overtime compensation to all non-exempt employees.

115. Plaintiff Beri and the California Class B members do not presently qualify, and have not at any time during the class period qualified, under any exemption from the requirement that their employer pay overtime compensation under California law because they spent more than one-half of their time performing non-exempt duties. Therefore, Plaintiff Beri and California Class B members are entitled to be paid overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

116. Throughout the class period, and continuing through the present, Plaintiff Beri and the California Class B members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in a workweek.

117. During the class period, Defendants have misclassified Named Plaintiff Beri and the California Class B members as exempt from overtime pay entitlement and have failed and refused to pay to them overtime premium pay for their overtime hours worked.

118. Plaintiff Beri requests relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 201-203
(by Plaintiff Beri on behalf of herself and proposed California Class C)

119. Plaintiff Beri hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

120. Plaintiff Beri brings this claim on behalf of herself and the proposed California Class C.

121. The class period for California Class C is from February 14, 2002 through the date

1 of the final disposition of this action.

2 122. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 201(a), "If an employer discharges an
3 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
4 immediately."

5 123. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 202 (a),

6 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period
7 quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and
payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has
8 given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
9 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time
of quitting.

10 124. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 203,

11 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or
12 reduction, in accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5,
13 any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the
14 wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date
thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is
commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30
15 days.

16 125. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1171.5(a),

17 All protections, rights, and remedies available under state law,
18 except any reinstatement remedy prohibited by federal law, are
available to all individuals regardless of immigration status who
have applied for employment, or who are or who have been
19 employed, in this state.

20 126. Defendants' conduct as alleged above constitutes a violation of California Labor
21 Code sections 201 through 203, because TCS failed to pay the entirety of dismissed class
22 members' wages owed to them within 72 hours of dismissal.

23 127. Plaintiff Beri requests relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

24 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
25 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 218.5, 227.3, and 201-203**
26 **(by Plaintiff Beri on behalf of herself and proposed California Class C)**

27 128. Plaintiff Beri hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all
preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

28 129. This claim is brought on behalf of Plaintiff Beri and the California Class C.

1 130. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 227.3,

2 Unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement,
 3 whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides
 4 for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having
 5 taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid
 6 to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of
 7 employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time
 8 served; provided, however, that an employment contract or
 employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation
 time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated
 representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested
 vacation time, shall apply the principles of equity and fairness.

9 131. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.5,

10 In any action brought for the nonpayment of wages, fringe benefits,
 11 or health and welfare or pension fund contributions, the court shall
 12 award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the prevailing party if
 any party to the action requests attorney's fees and costs upon the
 initiation of the action.

13 132. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1171.5(a),

14 All protections, rights, and remedies available under state law,
 15 except any reinstatement remedy prohibited by federal law, are
 16 available to all individuals regardless of immigration status who
 have applied for employment, or who are or who have been
 employed, in this state.

17 133. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 201(a), "If an employer discharges an
 18 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
 19 immediately."

20 134. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 202 (a),

21 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period
 22 quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and
 payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has
 23 given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time
 24 of quitting.

25 135. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 203,

26 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or
 27 reduction, in accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5,
 any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the
 28 wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date
 thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is
 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30

1 days.

2 136. The conduct alleged in this complaint constitutes a violation of California Labor
 3 Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 218.5, and 227.3, because Defendants' forfeiture of vested but unused
 4 vacation pay, as alleged above, constitutes an unlawful "use-it-or-lose-it" vacation policy. TCS
 5 did not reimburse its terminated employees with the vacation time they had accrued.

6 137. Named Plaintiff Beri requests relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

7 **EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
 8 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 226, 1174**
 9 (by Plaintiffs on behalf of the themselves and the proposed California Classes that they
 10 respectively represent)

11 138. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 12 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

13 139. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of themselves and the proposed California
 14 Employee Classes that they respectively represent.

15 140. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a),

16 Every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment
 17 of wages, furnish each of his or her employees, either as a
 18 detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the
 19 employee's wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal
 20 check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing
 21 (1) gross wages earned, . . . (4) all deductions, provided that all
 22 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
 23 aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, The
 24 deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink
 25 or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day,
 26 and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions
 27 shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the
 28 place of employment or at a central location within the State of
 California.

141. California Labor Code § 226(e) provides that an employee suffering injury as a
 1 result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) is
 2 entitled to recover the greater of his or her actual damages or a penalty of \$50 for the initial pay
 3 period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in subsequent pay
 4 period (up to a maximum of \$4,000), in addition to attorneys' fees and costs.

1 142. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174(d), employers shall keep
 2 at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at
 3 which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
 4 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-
 rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to,
 employees employed at the respective plants or establishments.

5 143. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1171.5(a),

6 All protections, rights, and remedies available under state law,
 7 except any reinstatement remedy prohibited by federal law, are
 8 available to all individuals regardless of immigration status who
 have applied for employment, or who are or who have been
 employed, in this state.

9 144. The conduct alleged in this complaint constitutes a violation of California Labor
 10 Code §§ 226 and 1174, as Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely,
 11 accurate, itemized wage statements to Plaintiffs and the proposed California Class Members.
 12 Defendants routinely changed the number of tax exemptions without first obtaining the consent
 13 and approval of the Plaintiffs and the California Class members. The wage statements Defendants
 14 provided to the class members did not accurately reflect the employees' gross or net wages, as
 15 they failed to discount the employees' tax refund checks that Defendants required the employees
 16 to return to the company. In addition, the wage statements Defendants provided to Class B
 17 members did not accurately reflect the total number of hours worked.

18 145. Plaintiffs request relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.

19 **NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
 20 **VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**
 21 **(by Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and the proposed California Classes that they
 22 respectively represent)**

23 146. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all
 24 preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

25 147. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of themselves and the proposed California
 26 Employee Classes that they respectively represent.

27 148. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 221, 226, 227.3, 510,
 28 1174, and 1194, as alleged above, constitute unlawful business acts or practices.

149. Defendants' failure to pay wages as alleged herein to Plaintiffs and members of the
 proposed classes under California Labor Code, and Defendants' failure to keep proper records, as

1 alleged herein, constitute unlawful activities prohibited by Business and Professions Code
 2 §§ 17200, *et seq.*

3 150. The actions of Defendants in failing to pay Plaintiffs and members of the proposed
 4 classes in a lawful manner and in collecting part of their wages previously paid to them, as
 5 alleged herein, constitute false, unfair, fraudulent and deceptive business practice, within the
 6 meaning of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

7 151. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein has damaged Plaintiffs and proposed Class
 8 members by wrongfully failing to pay them all wages due upon termination of employment, and
 9 by failing to provide itemized wage statements. Such conduct was substantially injurious to
 10 Plaintiffs and the proposed Classes.

11 152. Under the circumstances alleged herein, it would be inequitable and result in a
 12 miscarriage of justice for Defendants to continue to retain the property of Plaintiffs and proposed
 13 Class members, entitling Plaintiffs and proposed Class members to restitution of the unfair
 14 benefits obtained and disgorgement of Defendants' ill-gotten gains.

15 153. As a result of Defendants' unlawful business acts or practices, Defendants have
 16 reaped and continue to reap unfair benefits and illegal profits at the expense of Plaintiffs and the
 17 proposed California Classes.

18 154. Defendants' improper, unfair and unlawful business practices and acts alleged
 19 herein constitute a continuing threat to Plaintiffs, Class members, and members of the public in
 20 that, unless restrained, Defendants may continue to violate California Labor law. Pursuant to
 21 Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves, the California
 22 Classes, and the general public, seek a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to cease its
 23 unlawful and unfair business practices and acts.

24 155. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned practices and acts,
 25 Defendants have been unjustly enriched, and Plaintiffs, the proposed California Classes, and the
 26 general public are entitled to restitution in an amount to be determined at trial.

27 156. Plaintiffs request relief as provided in the Prayer for Relief below.
 28

RELIEF ALLEGATIONS

157. Plaintiffs and the classes they seek to represent have no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law to redress the wrongs alleged herein, and the injunctive relief sought in this action is the only means of securing complete and adequate relief. Plaintiffs and the classes they seek to represent are now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury from TCS's illegal acts.

158. The actions on the part of Defendant have caused and continue to cause Plaintiffs and the proposed classes substantial losses in earnings, other compensation, and other employment benefits, in an amount to be determined according to proof.

159. Defendants acted or failed to act as herein alleged with malice or reckless indifference to the protected rights of Plaintiffs and members of the proposed classes. Plaintiffs and members of the proposed classes are thus entitled to recover punitive damages in an amount to be determined according to proof.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the proposed classes, pray for relief as follows:

160. Certification of the case as a class action on behalf of the proposed Plaintiff classes, designation of Plaintiffs as representatives of the applicable classes as articulated above, and designation of their counsel of record as Class Counsel;

161. Damages and equitable relief for all harm Plaintiffs and the classes have sustained as a result of Defendants' conduct, according to proof;

162. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount commensurate with Defendants' ability to pay and to deter future unlawful conduct;

163. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants and their directors, officers, owners, agents, successors, employees, and representatives—and any and all persons acting in concert with them—from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, customs, and usages set forth herein;

164. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of in this complaint are

1 unlawful and violate applicable federal and state law;

2 165. Fees and costs incurred, including reasonable attorneys' fees, to the extent
3 allowable by law;

4 166. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as provided by law; and

5 167. Such other and further legal and equitable relief as this Court deems necessary,
6 just, and proper.

7 Dated: June 5, 2006

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP

8 By: /s/ Steven M. Tindall
9 Steven M. Tindall

10 James M. Finberg (State Bar No. 114850)
11 Steven M. Tindall (State Bar No. 187862)
12 Peter E. Leckman (State Bar No. 235721)
13 LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
14 Embarcadero Center West
15 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
16 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
17 Telephone: (415) 956-1000
18 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
898
899
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
998
999
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1098
1099
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1798
1799
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825<br

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial as provided by Rule 38(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Dated: June 5, 2006

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP

By: /s/ Steven M. Tindall
Steven M. Tindall

James M. Finberg (State Bar No. 114850)
Steven M. Tindall (State Bar No. 187862)
Peter E. Leckman (State Bar No. 235721)
LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
Telephone: (415) 956-1000
Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

Counsel for Plaintiffs